

MAR 25 2006

001

PTOL-413A (08-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/834,833
Examiner: Isaac M. WooFirst Named Applicant: Ramprakash Sathyanarayanan
Art Unit: 2172 Status of Application Response to Non-Final
Office Action Entered and Forwarded to Examiner

Tentative Participants:

- (1) For Applicant - Omkar Suryadevara (2) For USPTO - Examiner's Supervisor Hosain T. Alam
 (3) For USPTO - Examiner Isaac M. Woo (4) For USPTO - Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus

Proposed Date of Interview: April 21, 2006Proposed Time: 1:00 PM (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

- (1)
-
- Telephonic (2)
-
- Personal (3)
-
- Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) §101 Rejection	Claims 29-33		[]	[]	[]
(2) §112 Rejection	Claims 1 & 43		[]	[]	[]
(3) §102 Rejection	Claim 33	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
(4) §102 Rejection	Claim 31	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: For §101 & §112 rejections, see amendment dated 3/13/06.

For §102 rejection of Claim 33 – US 5,832,510 fails to disclose any item which is a link to itself.

For §102 rejection of Claim 31 – US 5,832,510 fails to disclose increasing a limit on a resource to maximum.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 3/8/2005.NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

S. Omkar Reg. 36,320

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

OMKAR K. SURYADEVARA (PHONE 408-982-8203)

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the fax number 571-273-8300 on 3/24/2006.SIGNATURE: S. Omkar

PTOL-413A

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (CONTINUED)**Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej. Obj. etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
§102 Rejection	Claim 38	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 30	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 4	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 19	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 11	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 1 (1 st argument)	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 1 (2 nd argument)	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 1 (3 rd argument)	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 1 (4 th argument)	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]
§102 Rejection	Claim 1 (5 th argument)	US 5,832,510	[]	[]	[]

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Claim 38 – US 5,832,510 fails to disclose any list of items to be excluded from copying.

Claim 30 – US 5,832,510 fails to disclose neither the word "email" nor any "message" in this entire patent.

Claim 4 -- US 5,832,510 at most discloses that multiple processes are loaded into memory, but without any limit on their number. Their storage space has no relevance to the number of processes. US 5,832,510 fails to disclose comparing the number of processes with a limit, and waiting if limit is exceeded.

Claim 19 – US 5,832,510 at most discloses checking if an item is a directory or not, i.e. checking its type. But it fails to disclose checking if the item is a current directory or a parent directory.

Claim 11 – US 5,832,510 at most discloses loading programs from disk to memory and use of a copy file table for files being copied between two devices. But it fails to disclose DMA & buffer locking.

Claim 1 (1st arg) – US 5,832,510 discloses only function calls in his steps 2010-2050, by a recursive call in step 2070 and by a call to another routine in step 2030 - but it fails to disclose creating a new process.Claim 1 (2nd arg) – US 5,832,510 discloses new process creation elsewhere, but no "spawning" in his Fig. 20.Claim 1 (3rd arg) – Even if US 5,832,510 can be modified to spawn, no motivation to spawn in his step 2070.Claim 1 (4th arg) – Even if US 5,832,510 can be modified to spawn in his step 2070 why not also in step 2030?Claim 1 (5th arg) – Even if US 5,832,510 can be modified to spawn in only one step, why pick 2070 & not 2030

Applicant's Representative Signature:	Examiner/SPE Signature
S. Omka	